

SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS

February 5, 2004

MINUTES

THE FOLLOWING MINUTES ARE A SUMMARY OF ACTIONS TAKEN BY THE TRANSPORTATION AND COMMUNICATIONS COMMITTEE. AUDIO-CASSETTE TAPES OF THE ACTUAL MEETING ARE AVAILABLE FOR LISTENING IN SCAG'S OFFICE.

The Southern California Association of Governments Transportation and Communications Committee (TCC) met at SCAG offices in Downtown Los Angeles.

MEMBERS PRESENT

Voting Members Present

Lee Ann Garcia, Chair
Harry Baldwin
Ron Bates
Lou Bone
Art Brown
Lawrence Dale
Gene Daniels
Richard Dixon
Bonnie Flickinger
Gary George
Frank Gurule
Carol Herrera
Sandra Jacobs
Robin Lowe
Bonnie Lowenthal
Llewellyn Miller
Pam O'Connor
Gary Ovitt
Greg Pettis
Will Pieper
Bea Proo
Tod W. Ridgeway
Ron Roberts
Greig Smith
David A. Spence
Dick Stanford
Tom Sykes
Paul Talbot
Tonia Reyes Uranga

City/County Representing

Grand Terrace
San Gabriel
Los Alamitos
Tustin
Buena Park
Barstow
Paramount
Lake Forest
Moreno Valley, WRCOG
Redlands, SANBAG
Cudahy
Diamond Bar
El Segundo
Hemet
Long Beach
Claremont
Santa Monica
Ontario
Cathedral City, CVAG
Desert Hot Spring
Pico Rivera
Newport Beach
Temecula, WRCOG
Los Angeles
Arroyo Verdugo Cities
Azusa
Walnut
Alhambra
Long Beach

Voting Members Absent

Glen Becerra
Paul Biane
Yvonne Burke
George Cole
Bill Davis
Joy Defenbaugh
Cathryn DeYoung
Judy Dunlap
John Fasana
Larry Grogan
Peter Herzog
Robert Hunter
Tim Keenan
Patsy Marshall
Judy Mikels
Jeff Miller
Keith Millhouse
Mark Nuaimi
Jeffrey Reinhardt
Charles Smith
Cameron Smyth
Sidney Tyler
Linda Wilson

Representing

Simi Valley
County of San Bernardino
County of Los Angeles
Bell, Gateway Cities COG
Simi Valley, VCTC
Riverside
Laguna Niguel
Inglewood
Duarte, SGVCOG
El Centro, IVAG
Lake Forrest
Victorville
Cypress
Buena Park
Ventura County
Corona
Moorpark
Fontana, SANBAG CTC
Las Virgenes/Malibu
County of Orange, OCTA
Santa Clarita, North LA County
Pasadena
Manhattan Beach/South Bay Cities

Voting Members, Not Elected Officials Present

Rose Casey

Representing

Caltrans, Los Angeles

Voting Members, Not Elected Officials Absent

Board Member
Rotating Board Member

Representing

California, DOT
Air Resources Board

Transportation Commissions – Vacant

Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority

New Members

None at this time

1.0 CALL TO ORDER

Chair Lee Ann Garcia called the meeting to order at 10:30 a.m.

2.0 PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD

No public comments

3.0 CONSENT CALENDAR

The following consent calendar items were MOVED, SECONDED, and UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED:

3.1 Approval Items

3.1.1 December 4, 2003 Meeting Minutes

3.2 Receive and File

3.2.1 Intergovernmental Review Clearinghouse Reports Attachment

4.0 ACTION ITEMS

4.1 Approve Highway Task Force Recommendations on 101 Corridor

Mr. Richard Dixon, Lake Forest, pointed out that there were three recommended actions on the 101 Corridor on Page 57 of the Agenda and on the Matrix on Page 4. He then made the motion to approve the recommendations on the 101 Corridor.

It was MOVED, SECONDED, and UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED to adopt the Highway Task Force Recommendations on 101 Corridor.

4.2 Approve Highway Task Force Recommendation on I-710 Corridor

It was pointed out that there was language change on Item 2 of the recommendations that could be found on Page 59 of the agenda.

Mr. Al Bowser, SCAG staff, stated that following the meeting of the Highway and Finance Task Force the language was changed to read: while additional work is in progress to identify feasible improvements in the Corridor, the 2004 Regional Transportation Plan identifies the existing commitments to replace the Gerald Desmond bridge approved as part of the financially constrained plan and the rest stays as is. Mr. Bowser then clarified that the bridge would be reconstructed to the point that it would be replaced and the language would be changed to replace. The three language points to be changed are; replace, Gerald, and approved as part of the financially constrained plan.

The question was raised whether this had anything to do with the extension of 710 Freeway through Pasadena? Mr. Bowser responded that it did not, it was from the ports of Los Angeles through Long Beach to Route 60.

4.2 Approve Highway Task Force Recommendation on I-710 Corridor (cont.)

Mr. Ron Bates, Los Alamitos, then stated that he understood the language of reconstruct, but when replace is used, he inquired if the replacement would take place in approximately the same Corridor as the current bridge? Mr. Bowser responded that it would and pointed out that it was both a height and width issued surrounding the bridge.

Ms. Bea Proo, Pico Rivera, then stated that MTA had submitted to SCAG some language they asked to be included regarding the funding and inquired as to why it was deleted. Mr. Bowser pointed out that point #4 on the original recommendation covered that. Staff does anticipate that additional funds will be needed which could be existing, new, or innovative.

Motion was made to approve the items. Motion was SECONDED, and UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED to adopt the I-710 Corridor Issue Matrix Item with the changes.

4.3 Southern California Consensus Program for TEA-21

Mr. Don Rhodes, SCAG staff, announced that SCAG will take the Consensus document, which includes approximately \$11 billion in projects, to Washington on February 11 and 12. This will be SCAG's second trip, the first was done a year ago. This time around the Consensus Program was sent out for some revision of numbers and there was some discussion on individual projects. All the projects in the plan, with an exception of one or two, were included the first time the Consensus document was taken back to Washington.

Ms. Carol Herrera, Diamond Bar, stated that the San Gabriel Valley COG had some very serious issues with the proposal on Page 20 which was the State Route 60 Truck Way. The San Gabriel Valley COG supports a feasibility study but does not support the specifics of putting in 3 billion dollars for a dedicated truck way on State Route 60 and instead supports studying the East West Corridor. In the first sentence, "substitute dedicated truck way with capacity improvements along the East West Corridor which would include the I-10, I-210, SR-60, and the SR-91.

Ms. Bea Proo, Pico Rivera, then added that GMAC came up with the term 'The Eastern Gateway Capacity Enhancement' instead of saying the 60 Freeway in order to maintain the required transportation air conformity. By inserting this term, you are then dealing with the whole area that was indicated by Ms. Herrera. Ms. Proo then requested that it be named as such.

4.3 Southern California Consensus Program for TEA-21 (cont.)

Mr. Hasan Ikhata, SCAG staff, stated that there would be no problem in naming it the "East West Corridor", not specifying any route, and that the language should read as such in the document.

Mr. Ron Bates, Los Alamitos, expressed that maybe this name change would suffice for the joint trip back to Washington, but he was not sure that this vagueness would suffice for the RTP. While we are trying to be general for consensus purposes, when it gets to the RTP there should be an effort made to develop some consensus on this project as the truck lanes on the 60 are a very significant component of meeting air quality conformity in the entire RTP.

Ms. Robin Lowe, Hemet, expressed that her concern was the same as Mr. Bates. She raised the question to the Gateway COG, if they were planning a corridor that the Committee is not aware of?

Ms. Proo's response to the question was that she was not speaking just as Gateway, but as MTA also. The whole Matrix needs to be looked at, the Committee can not just specify that it will be the SR-60. It is important not to disgruntle the public with all the corridors because they think something might happen to their city or home, but at the same time the Committee needs to recognize that there has to be some mitigation of the truck traffic. Ms. Lowe then asked Ms. Proo how she envisioned the Committee addressing that in the RTP. Ms. Proo stated that capacity improvements are needed to accommodate the change in traffic both in passenger, as well as freight.

Mr. Ikhata then stated that for the consensus document the Committee could be general, but for the RTP improvements need to be specific. It is wrong for the Committee to be so generic in saying let us build something from the 91, in the South Bay, all the way to the 210. We cannot be so vague with the RTP. Staff has had task forces working on the language since 1998 and is committed to it. Mr. Ikhata questioned why the language is being questioned at this stage when it could have been addressed years ago.

Mr. Ron Bates explained: to get from the I-15 to the I-710 one has three choices. You have the I-10, SR-60, and lastly the SR-91 that goes through Riverside. One probably would not go over Kellogg Hill with the trucks. If you take the SR-91 and widen that freeway it will affect half the city, that will not work. That leaves us with only one option, the SR-60. As Mr. Ikhata stated, this has all been studied over the last six years. In reality, after the study was done a conclusion was made that the truck lanes would go on the SR-60.

4.3 Southern California Consensus Program for TEA-21 (cont.)

Mr. Ron Roberts, Temecula, agreed with speakers and Staff on support of an East West Corridor for the consensus trip, especially after meeting with leaders in the freight industry who have already bought-in on a Truck Lane. The Committee is too far through the process now to be generic again. The SR-60 now is at capacity and the gridlock will get even worse before we can do something.

Ms. Carol Herrera, Diamond Bar, then stated that she was part of the study on the truck lanes in 1998 and chaired the study for the SGV COG. Data was collected, but the study was never implemented or continued because there was no further funding coming from SCAG for the COG to finish the study recommendations should be. The data showed that trucks were almost as heavy on the SR-60 as they were on other freeways. To say that the SR-60 should have all the truck traffic is disingenuous. In addition, that region currently has the worst air quality in Southern California at this time.

Mr. Ikhrata then agreed that Staff and the Committee indeed needed to focus on the East West Corridor. He added that Staff had gone as far as selecting a consultant with Caltrans and the County Transportation Commissions to move forward with a route that would make sense. But this did not take place because we still are not in agreement. Questions are still being raised as to whether this is a regional priority.

Mr. Ikhrata then clarified that the specifics in the RTP are that there are two lanes in each direction, equivalent capacity, on the SR-60 Freeway. In the language it states that when the study of the East West Corridor is completed we will then specify what the route is, we are not yielding to the SR-60 at this point. We proposed 6 million dollars for this work and have tried to work with the stakeholders to develop a consensus without much success thus far. SR-60 was designated as a truck route as a result of the feasibility study, which did not include other corridors. Truck models were run that indicated the highest volume in the region was the SR-60, and preliminary engineering suggested the SR-60 because of effectiveness. At this point the Committee needs to commit to continue the study to determine which east west route should be included in the plan.

The Committee and Staff then agreed that any reference to Route 60 would have to be edited out in the language. Chair Garcia requested that once Staff had all the edits completed that it be sent to the TCC members.

4.3 Southern California Consensus Program for TEA-21 (cont.)

Motion was made to approve the item. Motion was SECONDED, and UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED to adopt the Consensus Document with the change of any reference to Route 60 would be East West Corridor.

5.0 INFORMATION ITEMS

5.1 Update on Transportation Finance and Conformity Implications

Ms. Annie Nam, SCAG Staff, introduced Mr. Art Bauer, SCAG's Financial Consultant, who provided a brief overview of the State Budget as well as what's been happening to date in Sacramento.

Mr. Ron Bates, Los Alamitos, asked the question as to the legality of the State borrowing from the State Highway Account and the initiatives to control how the money is being used. How was the State dealing with the legal issues that may arise when taxpayers have paid the money to go directly into state transportation projects? Mr. Bauer responded that the State may borrow from the account for cash flow purposes throughout any fiscal year. There is borrowing for inter-fund transfers but that money has to be paid back. Additionally, he stated that the recommendation in the RTP to fix Proposition 42 in terms of transportation would be very useful reform to account for how the money is spent.

5.2 Community Environmental and Transportation Acceptability Process (CETAP)

Ms. Robin Lowe, RCTC Chairperson, introduced Ms. Cathy Becthal, Riverside County Commission Director of Planning and Programs, who gave a presentation of the history of CETAP. CETAP was the transportation element of the Integrated Plan for Riverside County and the project was selected as one of the seven Streamline Projects in the United States last year.

Ms. Becthal stated that RCTC's position on the Consensus was that just doing improvements on the 91 won't be enough, there needed to be an array of improvements. In addition, Riverside County needs a new corridor.

Mr. Ron Bates, Los Alamitos, commented on the car pool lane that has not been complete on the I-15. He asked what RCTC had been coordinating with the San Diego region so that whatever developments did take place, they would be in a coordinated manner so traffic does not get grid locked from one end of the County to the other? Ms. Becthal responded that they had have meetings with San Diego County and it was not going as well

5.3 Community Environmental and Transportation Acceptability Process (CETAP) (cont.)

because their focus was only as far as Escondido. RCTC is encouraging them to look further towards the County line.

5.4 RTP and Public Hearing

Staff presented a brief summary of comments received thus far on the Draft 2004 RTP as well as comments received at the public hearing held on January 15. Comments close on February 9th and Staff will prepare responses to the comments and will adjust the Plan as appropriate and bring it back to the Committee for their approval on March 4th.

5.5 RPT/Issue Matrix

Staff presented an update along with a handout on the RTP/Issue Resolution Matrix. The document is a working document that will be presented to the Committee monthly all the way to the approval of the RTP in April.

Staff will present to the Committee the final RTP and public comments at the next meeting.

6.0 MAGLEV TASK FORCE REPORT

The task force is completing the study from LAX South into Orange County and John Wayne Airport. On local matching allocations there are three grants, two in fiscal year 2003, one for \$500K and another for \$1M, and the another \$1M in 2004. There is no match required for the 2004 so that money is available. For the \$1M in 2003 there needs to be a match. So far there is \$200K from the City of Ontario and \$237K from SanBAG, totaling \$437K. Hopefully the balance will come from L.A. With the \$500K grant in 2003 there is no match required, so as of right now there is \$1.5M available to the Maglev Task Force. It is anticipated that there will be another \$1M available later in this fiscal year.

7.0 REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION AGENCIES COALITION (RTAC) REPORT

No report at this time.

8.0 REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION DEMAND MANAGEMENT (RTAC) REPORT

No report at this time.

9.0 CHAIR REPORT

No report at this time

10.0 STAFF REPORT

No report at this time

11.0 FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS

No additional agenda items were identified.

12.0 ANNOUNCEMENTS

No announcements

13.0 ADJOURNMENT

Chair Garcia adjourned the meeting at 12:00 pm

The next TCC Committee Meeting will be March 4, 2004 at 10:30 a.m.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Hasan M. Ikhata', written over a horizontal line.

Hasan M. Ikhata, Director
Planning and Policy